

REMARKS

[0008] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 4-7, 8, 9, 14-27, 29, 30 and 34-37 are currently pending.
- Claims 6, 7, 14 and 21-23 and 35-37 are canceled herein.
- Claims 1, 5, 8, 15, 16-18, 20, 25-27, 30 and 34 are amended herein.

Support for Claim Amendments

[0009] Claim 1 is amended to recite, “audio/video information”. Support for this amendment is found at least at paragraph [0002].

[0010] Claim 1 is amended to recite, “the command activated by operation of a mark button on a remote control associated with the first processing mechanism”. Support for this amendment is found at least at Figs. 3-4 and associated text, which discuss the mark button 146.

[0011] Claim 1 is amended to recite, “the command activated by operation of a mark button on a remote control associated with the first processing mechanism”. Support for this amendment is found at least at Figs. 1-3, all of which disclose the mark button. Also, paragraph [0030] and others discuss the operation of the mark button and associated mark commands.

[0012] Claim 1 is amended to recite, “displaying a visual indicator of the mark at the second processing mechanism”. Support for this amendment is found at least at Figs. 12-15. For example, 1206-1212 in Fig. 12 show visual indicators of marks, each visual

indicator being a thumbnail image, as disclosed at paragraph [0137] and other locations.

[0013] Claim 1 is amended to recite, “displaying, within a thumbnail display region, a thumbnail image of a frame of the information presented using the first processing system, the frame taken from the information being displayed at a point in time that the mark was created, the thumbnail image accompanied upon selection by a text legend indicating time remaining on a fixed period of time, after which the thumbnail image will be removed”. Support for this amendment is found at least at paragraphs [0110], [0137], and 1214 of Fig. 12, and other locations, wherein capture of an image for creation of a thumbnail image, and “small renditions of video frames” for thumbnail images is discussed.

[0014] Claim 1 is amended to recite, “displaying, in a larger region, a fuller sized version of a thumbnail image selected from among thumbnail images in the thumbnail display region.” Support for this amendment is found, for example, at least at paragraph [0145] and Fig. 12 and associated discussion, wherein region 1202 is a fuller sized version of thumbnail 1206.

[0015] Claim 1 is amended to recite, “removing the thumbnail image from the thumbnail display region at conclusion of the fixed period of time.” Support for this amendment is found, for example, at paragraphs [0110] and [0125].

[0016] Claim 1 is amended to recite, “displaying an access point to allow access to all removed thumbnail images after the fixed period of time.” Support for this amendment is found, for example, at icon 1316 of Fig. 13, which illustrates an icon access point to allow access to thumbnail images that have scrolled out of the region 1304 due to the

passage of time. Support for this amendment is also found at paragraph [0149], which discusses an access point allowing access to a location wherein the thumbnail images associated with marks go after they have aged sufficiently.

[0017] Claim 1 is amended to recite, “the presenting in response to operation of a mark button on a remote control associated with the second processing mechanism.” Support for this amendment is found at least at Fig. 6 and associated discussion, which discloses aspects of invoking an existing mark at a second or “destination” location.

[0018] Claims 27 and 30 are similarly amended, and are similarly supported.

Cited Documents

[0019] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Novak:** Novak et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0126599
- **Gatto:** Gatto et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,346,917
- **Vasilevsky:** Vasilevsky, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0166258
- **Jakel:** Jakel et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0016951
- **Hertzberg:** Hertzberg et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0022132
- **Vallone:** Vallone, U.S. Patent No. 6,642,939
- **Lu:** Lu et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,647,548
- **Carver:** Carver et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,451,467

Claims 1, 4-6, 15-23, 25-27, 29-30 and 34-36 Are Non-Obvious Over Novak in view of Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel and Herzberg

[0020] Claims 1, 4-6, 15-20, 25-27, 29-30 and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Novak in view of Gatto further in view of Vasilevsky in view of Jakel further in view of Herzberg. Without acquiescing to the merits of the rejection, the Applicant amends the claims 1, 27 and 30 and respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0021] At least in view of the amendments, the Applicant respectfully submits that Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel and Herzberg fail to make a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 1 is obvious. The respectfully Applicant submits that the cited documents of record do not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added to indicate points of discussion):

1. (Currently Amended) A method for presenting information, the method comprising:

presenting the information using a first processing mechanism;

receiving, while presenting the information using the first processing mechanism, a user-submitted command, **the command activated by operation of a mark button on a remote control associated with the first processing mechanism;**

adding, in response to the user-submitted command, a mark that is associated with the information, using a marking mechanism of the first processing mechanism;

transferring the information from the first processing mechanism to a second processing mechanism, the second processing mechanism being physically distinct from the first processing mechanism;

displaying a visual indicator of the mark at the second processing mechanism, the displaying comprising:

displaying, within a thumbnail display region, a thumbnail image of a frame of the information presented using the first

processing system, the frame taken from the information being displayed at a point in time that the mark was created, **the thumbnail image accompanied, upon selection, by a text legend indicating time remaining on a fixed period of time;**
displaying, in a larger region, a fuller sized version of a thumbnail image selected from among thumbnail images in the thumbnail display region;
removing the thumbnail image from the thumbnail display region at conclusion of the fixed period of time; and
displaying an access point to allow access to the thumbnail image after the fixed period of time; and
presenting the information using the second processing mechanism based on the mark added using the first processing mechanism, **the presenting in response to operation of a mark button on a remote control associated with the second processing mechanism.**

[0022] Discussing the amendments in turn, claim 1 recites in part,

- the thumbnail image accompanied, upon selection, by a text legend indicating time remaining on a fixed period of time
- removing the thumbnail image from the thumbnail display region at conclusion of the fixed period of time
- displaying an access point to allow access to the thumbnail image after the fixed period of time

[0023] Without acquiescing to the rejection, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to further refine aspects of “displaying a visual indicator”. At least in view of the amendment, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited documents of record fail to teach or suggest the cited claim elements.

[0024] The amendments advantageously indicate a “time remaining” on a “fixed period of time” (supported, for example, by 1214 of Fig. 12), and, “removing the thumbnail image ... at (the) conclusion of the fixed period of time,” after which, display of an “access point allow(s) access to the thumbnail images.” Accordingly, the

thumbnail images occupy the thumbnail display region only for a period of time that is displayed when the thumbnail is selected (e.g., in the manner of time display 1214 in Fig. 12, wherein police drama is selected). This advantageously prevents unduly inundating lists with too many marks and associated thumbnail images (see additional support for the amendment at the Applicant's paragraph [0110]).

[0025] The Office has not examined this aspect, which is a refinement of the prior claim. However, the Office previously noted that Novak in view of Gatto failed to disclose the "visual indicator" (Office Action mailed 12/28/2009, middle of page 5), but suggested that Vasilevsky disclosed the recited language. The Applicant agrees with the Office's conclusion regarding Novak and Gatto, and respectfully submits that, at least in view of the amendments, Vasilevsky fails to teach or suggest the elements of the claim.

[0026] Referring to Vasilevsky, a digital video recording system adapted for multiple locations and bookmarking is disclosed. Bookmarking and program recording are disclosed. Referring to Vasilevsky, at Figs. 2-7, aspects of a user interface are seen. At Fig. 5, screen shots are used for bookmark icons. At Fig. 7, a more tabular form of the bookmark screen is presented. However, Vasilevsky fails to teach or suggest "the thumbnail image accompanied, upon selection, by a text legend indicating time remaining on a fixed period of time," "removing the thumbnail image from the thumbnail display region at conclusion of the fixed period of time," and/or, "displaying an access point to allow access to the thumbnail image after the fixed period of time."

[0027] The Office points to Herzberg, at reference designator 73 in Fig. 7, as teaching expiration of bookmarks. In particular, Hertzberg describes a drop-down menu to select

an expiration time. However, Hertzberg fails to teach or suggest, “the thumbnail image accompanied upon selection by a text legend indicating time remaining on a fixed period of time,” “removing the thumbnail image from the thumbnail display region at conclusion of the fixed period of time,” and, “displaying an access point to allow access to the thumbnail image after the fixed period of time,” as recited by claim 1, as amended.

[0028] Consequently, the cited documents of record do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, at least in view of the amendment, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

[0029] Continuing to discuss the amendments in turn, claim 1 also recites, in part,

- the command activated by operation of a mark button on a remote control associated with the first processing mechanism
- the presenting (of the information being) in response to operation of a mark button on a remote control associated with the second processing mechanism

[0030] Accordingly, the claim advantageously recites that a mark button, on a first remote control associated with the first processing mechanism, commands creation of the mark, while a mark button on a second remote control associated with the second processing mechanism invokes presentation according to the created mark. Thus, the user advantageously had a simplified user interface, in that operation of the mark button both creates a mark and invokes operation of the mark.

[0031] In view of the amendment, the Office has not cited documents against this aspect. However, a review of Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel and Herzberg does not reveal a teaching or suggestion of such a user interface, including a remote. The primary

document, Novak, discloses a remote control, in Fig. 2. However, the disclosure lacks a teaching of the recited detail including operation of a mark button.

[0032] Consequently, the cited documents of record do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, at least in view of the amendment, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

[0033] Continuing to discuss the amendments in turn, claim 1 also recites, in part,

- displaying, in a larger region, a fuller sized version of a thumbnail image selected from among thumbnail images in the thumbnail display region

[0034] Claim 1 has been amended to recite a fuller sized version of the thumbnail image that is selected. This is supported at least at Fig. 12, wherein the thumbnail image 1206 is selected and the image 1202 is of fuller size.

[0035] The amended claim language advantageously provides a better view of the selected thumbnail image selected from among thumbnail images in the thumbnail display region.

[0036] In view of the amendment, the Office has not cited documents against this aspect. However, a review of Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel and Herzberg does not reveal a teaching or suggestion of such a user interface. Vasilevsky discloses a user interface with small screen shots (Fig. 5). However, Vasilevsky fails to teach or suggest “displaying, in a larger region, a fuller sized version of a thumbnail image selected from among thumbnail images”.

[0037] Consequently, the cited documents of record do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, at least in view of the amendment, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 4-6, 15-20, 25-26 and 34-36

[0038] Claims 4-6, 15-20, 25-26 and 34-36 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 4-6, 15-20, 25-26 and 34-36 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claims 27 and 30

[0039] Claims 27 and 30 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Accordingly, the remarks from above are incorporated at this location by reference. For at least the reasons cited above, the cited documents of record do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, at least in view of the amendments, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 29

[0040] Claim 29 ultimately depends from independent claim 27. As discussed above, claim 27 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 29 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim. This claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 8 Is Non-Obvious Over Novak in view of Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel, Herzberg and Vallone

[0041] Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Novak in view of Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel, Herzberg and Vallone. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Vallone addresses the issue of deleting a mark. Accordingly, Vallone was not cited as, nor does it, render obvious aspects of claim 1. Accordingly, the Vallone reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Novak, Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel and Herzberg with regard to the features of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Novak in view of Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel, Herzberg and Vallone. Accordingly, claim 8 is allowable, at least for its dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Claim 9 Is Non-Obvious Over Novak in view of Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel, Herzberg and Lu

[0042] Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Novak in view of Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel, Herzberg and Lu. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Lu addresses the issue of channel surfing or fast channel changes, and their effect on data collected from such actions. Accordingly, Lu was not cited as, nor does it, render obvious aspects of claim 1. Accordingly, the Lu reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Novak, Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel and Herzberg with regard to the features of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Novak in view of Gatto, Vasilevsky, Jakel, Herzberg, Vallone, Herzberg and Lu. Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable, at least for its dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Conclusion

[0043] For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **the Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

_____/David S. Thompson 37954/

Dated: _____ 25 May 2010

David S. Thompson
Registration No. 37954
509-944-4735
DavidT@leehayes.com

Kayla D. Brant
Registration No. 46,576
509-944-4742
kayla@leehayes.com;